

REMARKS

Applicant is in receipt of the Office Action mailed March 20, 2008. Claims 1 and 6-23 are pending in the case. Reconsideration of the present case is earnestly requested in light of the following remarks.

Section 103 Rejections

Claims 1 and 6-23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Deutscher et al (2004/0001106, “Deutscher”) in view of Hampapuram et al. (2004/0221262 A1, “Hampapuram”). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claim 1 recites:

1. A memory medium which stores program instructions implementing a graphical user interface (GUI) for debugging a program, wherein, during execution of the program, the program instructions are executable by a processor to perform:

displaying source code for the program on a display during execution of the program;

receiving first user input hovering a mouse cursor over an expression in the source code;

in response to said hovering the mouse cursor over the expression, displaying a GUI element proximate to the expression, wherein the GUI element includes a value of the expression;

receiving second user input to the GUI element modifying the displayed value, thereby specifying a new value for the expression; and

setting the expression in the program to the new value in response to the second user input, wherein the program continues execution in accordance with the new value of the expression.

Applicant respectfully submits that Deutscher fails to disclose, **displaying source code for the program on a display during execution of the program**, as recited in claim 1.

Deutscher is directed to a multimedia presentation production system in which presentation data are separated from presentation logic (see, e.g., paragraph [0008]). More specifically, per [0009], Deutscher discloses a tool which is

...essentially an intelligent visual data editor for making rich media presentations. Upon publishing from the tool, the required elements are organized and edited to contain the proper metadata in a single publishing directory. More particularly, **the tool consists of graphic user interfaces for easily entering the data associated with the rich media presentation. The tool is also designed to make it simple and easy to edit the data of the underlying schema.** (*emphasis added*)

As described in [0017]-[0018], among the various data entry graphical user interfaces (GUIs) disclosed are “data entry grids”, which are displayed in a presentation tool window. As [0018] reads in pertinent part:

...the data entry grids allow the user to enter the information into the presentation data file and the master track media file that is needed to drive the timeline of the presentation. The first of these grids, which is displayed by default once the master track program has been imported, **is the scripts grid**. The scripts grid is where the user enters events called script commands that will be triggered during the playback of the presentation. (*emphasis added*)

The Office Action equates Deutscher’s scripts grid with Applicant’s claimed source code of an executing program, which Applicant respectfully submits is not technically correct, since, as Deutscher explains above, and as described in more detail in Deutscher’s section 2.6.1 ([0137] – [0144]), the scripts grid is “essentially a scheduling table where the user enters events (sometimes referred to as script commands) that will be triggered during the playback of the presentation”. Note that the entered data in the various data grids (including the scripts grid) are saved to the presentation data file, which is then referenced by the presentation system to present the multimedia presentation.

In direct contrast, as one of skill in the programming arts readily understands, “source code” is a term of art in the programming domain and refers specifically to program instructions in a programming language that may be compiled (or interpreted, which is really just run-time compiling) to produce executable code that may be run on a processor.

Clearly, the cited script grid of Deutscher is not source code for a program, and more specifically, is not source code for an *executing* program, but, as described in paragraph 137, is an editing tool for editing and providing data to a data file, which is then used by a presentation application to present a multimedia presentation. Nor does Deutscher describe any of the data grids as source code for a(n executing) program. Note, for example, that per paragraph 137, the program that is paused to allow for Deutscher’s scripts grid editing is “a video or audio program that is designated as the master track”, not an executable program for which the scripts grid is source code.

Thus, for at least the above reasons, Applicant submits that Deutscher fails to teach or suggest these features of claim 1. Nor does Hampapuram remedy this deficiency of Deutscher. For example, per Hampapuram’s Abstract, the macro expansions are processed by Hampapuram’s tool during the build process of a project (“during a build of a programming project’s source files”), where this processing operates to collect and record the macro expansion information into an output file or database. The tool then uses the recorded information to “display the macro expansions in a graphical user interface of the tool, such as for source browsing or viewing static analysis”. Applicant notes that “source browsing” and “viewing static analysis” are not run-time operations, and are nowhere described as being performed while the program is executing. Thus, Hampapuram also fails to teach or suggest these claimed features.

Applicant respectfully notes that since the cited art fails to teach “displaying source code for the program on a display during execution of the program”, the cited art also does not, and cannot, teach “receiving first user input hovering a mouse cursor over an expression in the source code”, nor “in response to said hovering the mouse cursor over the expression, displaying a GUI element proximate to the expression, wherein the GUI element includes a value of the expression”, nor “receiving second user input to the GUI element modifying the displayed value, thereby specifying a new value for the

expression”, nor “setting the expression in the program to the new value in response to the second user input, wherein the program continues execution in accordance with the new value of the expression”, as claimed.

Thus, for at least the reasons provided above, Applicant submits that the cited art of Deutscher and Hampapuram, taken singly or in combination, fails to teach or suggest all the features and limitations of claim 1, and so claim 1, and those claims respectively dependent therefrom, are patentably distinct and non-obvious over the cited art, and are thus allowable.

Independent claims 18-21 each includes similar limitations as claim 1, and so the above arguments apply with equal force to these claims. Thus, for at least the reasons discussed above, Applicant submits that claims 18-21, and those claims respectively dependent therefrom, are patentably distinct and non-obvious over the cited art, and are thus allowable.

Applicant also asserts that numerous ones of the dependent claims recite further distinctions over the cited art. However, since the independent claims have been shown to be patentably distinct, a further discussion of the dependent claims is not necessary at this time.

Removal of the section 103 rejection of claims 1 and 6-23 is earnestly requested.

CONCLUSION

In light of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant submits the application is now in condition for allowance, and an early notice to that effect is requested.

If any extensions of time (under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136) are necessary to prevent the above-referenced application(s) from becoming abandoned, Applicant(s) hereby petition for such extensions. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees which may be required or credit any overpayment to Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert & Goetzel P.C., Deposit Account No. 50-1505/5150-82801/JCH.

Also filed herewith are the following items:

- ☐ Request for Continued Examination
- ☐ Terminal Disclaimer
- ☐ Power of Attorney By Assignee and Revocation of Previous Powers
- ☐ Notice of Change of Address
- ☐ Other:

Respectfully submitted,

/Jeffrey C. Hood/
Jeffrey C. Hood, Reg. #35198
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT(S)

Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert & Goetzel PC
P.O. Box 398
Austin, TX 78767-0398
Phone: (512) 853-8800
Date: 2008-05-16 JCH/MSW